

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**MAY 4, 2011**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Craig Boswell - Chair  
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair  
Tom Bottomley  
Dan Maldonado  
Scott Marble  
Andrew Call

MEMBERS ABSENT

Greg Lambright

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis  
Debbie Archuleta  
John Wesley  
Tom Ellsworth  
Angelica Guevara  
Wahid Alam  
Laura Hyneman  
Jim Law  
Paul Bleier  
Jeff Welker  
Scott Duncan  
Lynda Bailey

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Big O Tires  
6702 East McKellips

**REQUEST:** Review of a tire store

### **DISCUSSION:**

Chair Craig Boswell:

- Doesn't think they need the roll-up door on the south elevation
- The entry gets lost

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned with the south roll-up door
- Everyone knows Home Depot is there
- They should be allowed to raise the entry so they can have the arch everyone else has
- Pad should shift south
- Could they change the parking and use 16' parking stalls with 2' overhang?
- Save as much landscaping as possible

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Has issue with the bay door facing McKellips
- The stripe looks like a sign
- The red stripe around the building is not compatible with the center
- Looks like they are tacking elements onto failing architecture
- Needs to be compatible with the center
- People know Michael's is behind the Chili's
- Needs to have a rhythm
- Columns should go up
- Building breaks are random
- Small elements don't have a big impact on height
- What if they have an element that comes down
- Need something to break up the elevation
- Lose the red band
- Parapet should look more like the center
- Band is too strippy, could it be stepped block or squares?
- Height and façade are the main issues
- Would really like the bay door on McKellips to go away
- More glass/polycarbonate on bay doors, can be sandblasted so you can't see inside

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Dan Maldonado:

- They can't soften the façade?
- There are no trees in front of the building
- Architecture very important because they don't have any landscaping to screen building
- Why is the equipment jammed up against the building?
- The equipment should be screened better and tucked in
- Could they pull the building over and provide landscaping on west side of building?
- Provide some foundation base landscaping

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CASE:** Hooter's  
1665 South Alma School

**REQUEST:** Review of the remodel of a vacant restaurant

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- All they are doing is painting
- All the gray and orange cheapens the building
- The orange stands out, but not in a good way
- Use color to create interest
- You don't see any articulation because everything is gray
- It still has a maritime theme
- The building is too plain, stucco with metal and a small amount of wood
- Building needs more articulation
- LED would have to be done well, not just tacked on

Chair Craig Boswell:

- Agree there is too much orange and too much gray.
- Opportunity to do splashes of orange
- Be more judicious
- Would like them to mitigate noise from neighbors
- Too much orange accent trim
- Provide another body color
- Lighting should be tasteful
- Covered patio should be covered
- Orange OK on north

Boardmember Dan Maldonado:

- This isn't dynamic
- Use the plains and layers
- The entry is interesting, bring it over to the patio
- The proportions of the colors are bad
- Need some variety
- Building is such a mass already
- So much galvanized already
- LED as accent only

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- If you look at their remodels, they haven't made the buildings better, they just paint gray and orange
- The Board is looking for design
- The orange is too much advertisement
- Pop the orange
- It cheapens the look
- Provide another body color for the building, the use gray and orange carefully
- Some times more is not better
- Why are you keeping the maritime theme?

Boardmember Scott Marble:

- Patio OK orange
- Too much orange on the front
- LED OK on front if it's done as an accent

Chair Boswell asked for input from citizens who were present for this case.

Trish Flower 1138 West Isabella. Ms. Flower stated she lived directly east of this project. She requested the corporate colors be an accent not the whole field. The landscaping is not that overgrown, it was maintained until 6 months ago. She wanted a screen wall at the delivery area, and landscaping at the east elevation. She was worried about noise from the outdoor dining. She stated the only access from the freeway was from Isabella. She agreed the colors were one dimensional. She wanted a new complementary color. She asked that they mitigate the orange. She stated this was an urban design, not residential. She was concerned with parking.

Lynda Bailey 1860 West Mulago Avenue. Ms. Bailey stated she was concerned with the color and the urban design. She wanted a softer color for the fabric awnings. She stated Dobson Ranch was excited about the Hooter's going into a vacant building.

Boardmember Bottomley:

- Building needs more change
- All the stucco is gray, all the metal is orange
- If you're going to do a detail on the building make it special
- The lights are orange, the roof is orange, the sign is orange
- The lights should be a different color
- They need to do more than just change the paint colors
- What if patio is trapezoidal or geometric
- Play with the northwest corner away from the neighbors

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Boardmember Maldonado:

- Should be able to remove some of the trees and replace with more appropriate trees, but must still meet the Code numbers
- Add trees at the east to screen neighbors from trash, loading, etc.
- OK with dark color at equipment well
- Work on landscaping along Isabella and east parking row

Boardmember LeSueur:

- Do a whole mass in darker gray
- On east elevation use darker color, more landscaping, but no LED
- Awning should be more architectural

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Craig Boswell called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 6, 2011 Meeting:

On a motion by Tom Bottomley seconded by Scott Marble the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

C. Take Action on all Consent Agenda items:

None

D. Discuss, receive comment and recommend to City Council the following Design Review Cases:

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE #: DR11-12    Mesa Grand FLM**

**ADDRESS:** The 1600 block of South Stapley Drive (east side).  
**GENERAL VICINITY:** Located south of the US 60 Superstition Freeway and east of Stapley Drive.  
**REQUEST:** Council Use Permit for a 65' Freeway Landmark Monument Sign (FLMS) for the existing Mesa Grand Shopping Center  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 4  
**OWNER:** Vestar Arizona XVII, LLC  
**APPLICANT:** Paul Bleier, Bleier Industries LTD  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Tom Ellsworth

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 65' tall Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

**SUMMARY:** Staffmember Tom Ellsworth stated Mr. Bleier had made changes to the elevations that addressed the Board's comments at the April meeting. Mr. Bleier stated he had two options; one that raised the CMU on both columns to 12'-4" or one that raised the CMU to 25', which was the base of the tenant panels. He stated he added reveal panels and had worked with Dunn Edwards on the new colors, because the original colors are out of production.

Chair Craig Boswell appreciated the changes. He confirmed that the request was to approve the sign with the electronic message board and the sign without the message board.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado confirmed the banding between the tenant panels would be green. He liked the colors, the darker green ties in and white letters will jump out. He hoped the red would not fade to pink.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the color choices. He did not like the CMU all the way to the tenant panels. He suggested 7' on one and something like 12' or 20' on the other.

Boardmember Maldonado suggested proportions of 1/3 on one column and 2/3 on the other.

Boardmember Andrew Call liked the proposed colors. He agreed the CMU should be 1/3 and 2/3.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dan Maldonado and seconded by Andrew Call that DR11-12 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the basic development of the Freeway Landmark Monument as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan except as noted below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Maximum sign height of 65 feet.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.



## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

6. Regarding the electronic message display:
  - a) The display is limited to text and picture messages only, with no animation or video.
  - b) The message change sequence is accomplished by an immediate on/off sequence, with each message being displayed for a minimum period of fifteen (15) seconds.
  - c) No continuous traveling or scrolling displays allowed.
  - d) The intensity of the LED display shall not exceed the levels specified in the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines.
7. Written certification from the sign manufacturer that the light intensity has been factory pre-set not to exceed the levels specified in the Freeway Landmark Monument Guidelines and the intensity level is protected from end-user manipulation by password-protected software or other method as deemed appropriate by the Development Services Director.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Lambright absent, Boardmember LeSueur left prior to this case)

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE #: DR11-13**      **Falcon Field Design Guidelines**  
**LOCATION/ADDRESS:**      Falcon Field Airport  
**GENERAL VICINITY:**      Located between McKellips Road (north side) and McDowell Road (south side), and between Greenfield Road (east side) and Higley Road (west side)  
**REQUEST:**      Approval of Design Guidelines  
**PURPOSE:**      This request will allow for the creation of Design Guidelines for the airport  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**      District 5  
**OWNER:**      City of Mesa  
**APPLICANT:**      City of Mesa  
**STAFF PLANNER:**      Angelica Guevara

**REQUEST:** Approval of Design Guidelines for Falcon Field Airport

**SUMMARY:** Laura Hyneman, of the Development and Sustainability Department and Jim Law, of Falcon Field Airport, represented the case. Staffmember Angelica Guevara explained the request and stated the Planning and Zoning Board had recommended approval of the Design Guidelines.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado asked about public involvement. Mr. Law stated there was a panel of existing tenants involved in the process, in fact they were the ones who wanted three character theme zones. Mr. Law stated there were five tenant meetings and three neighborhood meetings. Boardmember Maldonado confirmed there is a master plan for Falcon Field which the Design Guidelines will supplement.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the zones. He stated it was nice to acknowledge the historical area. He confirmed that the changes would occur over time as people redevelop or renovate, or as leases come due. He asked if the water tower color would change. Mr. Law stated the pilots like the color. Boardmember Bottomley thought there should a direction for change.

Chair Craig Boswell stated that as both a resident and an aviation buff he likes going to the airport. He hoped the Airport would keep the neighborhood park feel. He asked if they could create a park-setting along the flight line. He was very happy with the direction of the Design Guidelines.

Boardmember Scott Marble stated he likes getting close to the planes. He grew up going to Falcon Field. He welcomed the changes.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Scott Marble and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR11-13 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the Design Guidelines (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, or lot coverage).

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. The Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay is to allow height limits above those allowed in the M-1 zoning district subject to approval by the Airport Director.
4. Design details for the entrance feature, repainting of the water tower, new way-finding signage, light fixtures, benches, gates, and walls shall be added to the Design Guidelines after approval by the Airport and the Planning Director.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
6. All landside backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" or on the airside shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Full compliance with all current Code requirements, unless modified with the PAD as outlined in the staff report and Design Guidelines.
9. Review and approval of a Special Use Permit by the Board of Adjustment for a comprehensive sign plan.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Lambright absent, Boardmember LeSueur left prior to this case)

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

E. Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

All Aboard America  
230 South Country Club Drive  
Appeal of Planning Director's denial of the use of chain link fence

Scott Duncan represented the case. Mr. Duncan stated they had been at this location since the late 1990's and have not had a problem with graffiti like other sites around them. He stated the storage was for buses or drivers cars only. He stated the government requires chain link because it can be seen through and security can monitor the area. They were using grant money.

Chair Boswell stated chain link is visible from the public; however, you can achieve the same visibility and security with wrought iron. He stated the Board is tasked with applying the Code the same for everyone. Chain link OK on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue but not where visible from Country Club Dr. Wrought iron pickets should be 3" or 3.5" apart so it is less prone to prying open.

Boardmember Scott Marble asked if there had been complaints about the fence. The applicant stated they had sent out notices to neighbors. The notices were for the SCIP. The fence went in before the SCIP application without any approval,

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed they had put up new chain link just before they bought the adjacent lot. He agreed they may have overriding requirements to not use CMU, he suggested using steel fencing. A 6' or 8' steel fence would provide visibility. He was concerned with the use of the razor wire. He stated they could use the color of the fence to either draw attention or fade away. Bronze fades away.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado questioned how the landscape would work with the Federal Guidelines. He suggested they use landscaping to screen and discourage people from wandering onto the site. He suggested using deterrent landscaping like Cholla. He thought that where the project was exposed it should provide better fencing material. He stated they needed to use a landscape professional who can select appropriate trees. He suggested moving the fence in 5' to save money.

Boardmember Andrew Call agreed they need a portion of wrought iron and the appropriate use of landscaping.

It was moved by Boardmember Dan Maldonado and seconded by Boardmember Andrew Call that the Board approve the use of chain link on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and north and south portion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue access conditioned upon:

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2011 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

1. Entry drive and north fence to be replaced with approvable type fence material.
2. Where chain link remains provide landscape material that can screen and provide security by deterring people from the area. Landscape plan shall be designed by a landscape professional/Landscape Architect.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Lambright absent, Boardmember LeSueur left prior to this case)

F. Other business:

None

G. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:36

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da